APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,772	09/27/2001	Tomio Amano	JP9-2000-0267US1 (590.083	3441

35195	7590	05/18/2005

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
409 BROAD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143

EXAMINER
TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/965,772	AMANO, TOMIO
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quoc A. Tran	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 January 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
    application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to Amendment A filed 01/07/2005.

2.   Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12-13, 15-17 and 19-22 are independent

claims.

Response to Argument

3.   Applicant's arguments, filed 01/07/2005, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1-22

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection

has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Thielens et

al. US Patent No. 5,666,139 filed 03/03/1995 (hereinafter Thielens), in view of Stern et al. US

Pub No. 2003/0177115 A1 provisional No. 60/227,512 filed 08/24/200 (hereinafter Stern),

further in view of WordPerfect Version 5.1 for Dos – published by WordPerfect Corporation

1989 (hereinafter WordPerfect).

In regard to independent claim 1, defining a tag set to prevent errors or incorrect

character conversions that occur frequently during the re-input of text; and using a tag set

to add rewritten information to a predetermined portion of said application data (as taught

by Thielens at col. 17, line 65 through col. 18, line 20).

Thielens does not explicitly teach, **support method for application data written in a**

markup description language, however (as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0001] (i.e.

method in which the probability of errors occurring during the preparation of the scanned

documents), also (as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraph [0018] (i.e. document written in a

mark-up language including, but not limited to, HTML (hypertext mark-up language) or VRML

(virtual reality modeling language), dynamic HTML, XML (extensible mark-up language) or

XSL (XML styling language), or related computer languages thereof).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the

feature, wherein data written in a markup description language. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution,

which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention

in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at

page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

Thielens and Stern do not explicitly teach **error correction,** however (as taught by

WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or

grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed,

"error correction".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to

include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution,

which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention

in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at

page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017].

In regard to dependent claim 2, wherein said tag set is defined for at least one of a

character in the same shape, a similar character, a space or a character having a

complicated shape, (as taught by Thielens at col. 3, line 15 through col. 4, line 21, i.e.

Thielens provided a spelling checker, similar to conventional word processing computer

systems. Such spelling checkers generally include a master list).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Thielens does not explicitly teach, **wherein said**

markup description language is XML (Extensible Markup Language), however (as taught

by Stern at page 2, paragraph [0018].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the

feature, wherein the markup description language is XML (Extensible Markup Language). One

of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to

provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without

requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the

world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at

page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017].

In regard to independent claim 4, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claims 1 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the

same rationale.

writing correction code, which is based on a predetermined algorithm, however (as

taught by WordPerfect at pages 580-581. The Wp{wp}.spw file containing programming code

necessary to run the speller, which has the broadest reasonable interrelations as claimed.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to

include the means of Speller Dictionary featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the

art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction

solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual

intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught

by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014]

and [0017];

In regard to independent claim 5, wherein said correction code is calculated for a

character string that represents an attribute value or an attribute name, and is written

using a predetermined attribute for the description of an error code, however (as taught by

WordPerfect at pages 580-581. The Wp{wp}.spw file containing programming code necessary

to run the speller, which has the broadest reasonable interrelations as claimed.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of Speller Dictionary featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

In regard to independent claim 6, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 4 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 7, wherein said error correction codes are generated for all multiple character strings that are selected, and are added after predetermined elements of said application data have been written, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 579-583. The utility ADD in the supplementary dictionary, that allowing user to add to the main dictionary, which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of Speller Dictionary featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught

by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014]

and [0017].

In regard to independent claim 8, writing said attribute types to said application

data using a predetermined tag set, (as taught by Thielens at col. 17, line 65 through col. 18,

line 20, i.e. discloses the edit tag list, then the answer to step 454 is yes, whereupon an edit tag

text insert pad, similar to the one shown in FIG. 7, is displayed in step 460, and the copy editor

can add text to the edit tag insert pad in step 462 and display error message appears in step 468).

Thielens does not explicitly teach, sorting, into predetermined attribute types, words

in said application data that may constitute barriers in a context process; and transmitting

or storing said application data with which said attribute types are included, however, (as

taught by Stern at page 2, paragraph [0014], i.e. the term "computational device" includes, but is

not limited to, any type of computers operating according to any type of hardware and/or

operating systems; or any device, which could interpreted as claimed), also (as taught by Stern

at page 2, paragraph [0017], i.e. "Web server" refers to a server capable of transmitting a Web

page to the Web browser upon request, which could interpreted as claimed), also (as taught by

Stern at page 2, paragraph [0025], i.e. recognized words from the OCR process are preferably

indexed with the associated probability of error, which could interpreted as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the

feature, wherein an error correction support method for application data included transmitting,

sorting words in said application data that may constitute barriers in a context process from

predetermined attribute types, and writing said attribute types to said application data using a

predetermined tag set. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform

such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform

automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention, as taught as taught by Stern at

page 1, paragraph [0007].

In regard to independent claim 9, wherein said words that are sorted into said

predetermined attribute types and that may constitute barriers in said context process is

at the least one of a set comprising proper nouns, alphabetic abbreviations, tag names,

keywords that appear as attribute values, (as taught by Stern at page 4, paragraph [0049],

i.e. as illustrated in FIG. 3A -FIG. 3B shows for example the word "Henry" even when

misspelled as "Hehry", as shown by the underlined located search words).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the

feature, wherein said words that are sorted into said predetermined attribute types and that may

constitute barriers in said context process is at the least one of a set comprising proper nouns,

that appear as attribute values. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to

perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention, as taught as taught by

Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007].

In regard to independent claim 10, is directed to a system for performing the method of

claims 1, 4 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 11, is directed to a system for performing the method of

claim 6 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claims 12-13, are directed to a system for performing the method of claim 4 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 14, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 4, 5, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

when said automatic correction is determined to be possible, (as taught by Thielens at col. 9, line 45 through col. 10, line 15, i.e. discloses a global search and replace the spelling of the word with automatic effect).

In regard to independent claim 15, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1, 8, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

a word dictionary and individual character recognition results obtained from said text information, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

In regard to independent claim 16, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 4, 8, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

compares character with entries in a word dictionary, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed, "error correction".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

In regard to claims 17-18, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1, 4 and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

said application data including correction information that is printed on a paper-based document or form, (as taught by Thielens at col. 1, lines 30-35, i.e. The job of the copy editor is to carefully review the manuscript for changes therein. Specifically, the copy editor first manually folios or numbers all of the pages, and then reviews and edits the manuscript for grammatical and contextual errors by writing the changes on the printed manuscript, and flagging author queries and rewrites),

second computer receives, from said first computer, as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0017]-[0018], i.e. "Web browser" refers to any software program, which can display text, graphics, or both, from Web pages on World Wide Web sites. Hereinafter, the term "Web server" refers to a server capable of transmitting a Web page to the Web browser upon request, which could interpreted as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the feature, wherein an error correction support method for application, which could be extended to an application data provision system such that the second computer receives, from said first computer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution from any data sources, e.g. printed newspaper, microfilm, digital data...), which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention, as taught as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraphs [0003] and [0007].

In regard to independent claim 19, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 17-18 above, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

comparing individual character recognition results with entries in a word dictionary, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed, "error correction".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to

include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution,

which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention

in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at

page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

In regard to independent claim 20, is directed to a medium for performing the method

of claims 1, 6 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims independent claims 21-22, is directed to a medium for performing

the method of claims 1, 4 and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center

(EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
May 16, 2005

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER